UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

EPA United States Environmental Protection Agency Office of Pesticide Programs

MEMORANDUM

10/27/2022

SUBJECT: Acute Toxicity Review for *Shrub*, EPA File Symbol: 67619-45

FROM: Ian Blackwell, M.S., Biologist
Chemistry and Toxicology Team
Regulatory Management and Science Branch
Antimicrobials Division (7510M)

THRU: Jenny J. Tao, Senior Scientist (Acute Toxicology) 10/27/2022
Chemistry and Toxicology Team
Regulatory Management and Science Branch
Antimicrobials Division (7510M)

TO: Marcel Howard, Team 34/ Stacey Grigsby
Regulatory Management Branch II
Antimicrobials Division (7510M)

Registrant: CLOROX PROFESSIONAL PRODUCTS COMPANY	Case No.: 00374573
Submission No.: 1082040	E-Sub No.: 72534
Action Code Case No.: 00339023	Action Code: A572
MRID No(s).: 51780008	

Formulation from label			
PC code(s)	CAS #(s)	Active Ingredient(s)	% weight
128929	79-33-4	L-Lactic Acid	0.4
		Other Ingredients	99.6
		Total	100.0

1. BACKGROUND

The registrant, CLOROX PROFESSIONAL PRODUCTS COMPANY, has submitted an application to support a label amendment for their product: *Shrub*, EPA Registration Number 67619-45. The registrant is adding Electrostatic Spray Application to the label and requests waiving the requirement of Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) due to the added Electrostatic Spray Application. The registrant submitted *Toxicity Volume on Inhalation Risks and Respiratory Protection*, MRID number 51780008, a rationale for said waiver request. In this waiver request, the registration states their justification as follows:

"Justification:

The US EPA Antimicrobials Division met with Clorox on March 18, 2021, in a pre-submission meeting (Microsoft Teams meeting). At that meeting US EPA revealed that there is no known toxicological inhalation end point for lactic acid. For this reason, an inhalation risk assessment is not necessary since resulting risk estimates would be zero. It follows then that respiratory protection (PPE) would not be required for electrostatic spray use. The Agency recommended that Clorox submit a waiver for the inhalation risk assessment and PPE language. Thus, Clorox requests a waiver from an inhalation risk assessment and requests that labeling for Electrostatic use does not need language related to respiratory PPE."

2. FINDINGS

a. Apparently, the registrant is speaking of the Agency guidance, Instructions for Adding Electrostatic Spray Application Directions for Use to Antimicrobial Product Registrations, found at https://www.epa.gov/pesticide-registration/instructions-adding-electrostatic-spray-application-directions-use.

In the Agency guidance document, it is clearly indicated that:

"The following personal protective equipment (PPE) should be specified on the product label as part of the electrostatic spray directions for use:

- For chemicals that have low vapor pressures (less than 1. X 10^{-4} mm Hg), use N95 filtering facepiece respirators or half face respirators with N95 filters.
- For high vapor pressure chemicals (greater than 1. X 10^{-4} mm Hg), such as hydrogen peroxide, use half face respirators with chemical specific cartridges and N95 filters.
- Other personal protective equipment including gloves, clothing and eye protection is applicable as specified on the approved product label consistent with the acute toxicity profile of the product."

3. The requirements for PPEs for this label amendment of Reg. No. 67619-45, when Electrostatic Spray application is added, are derived from the aforementioned Agency Instructions for Adding Electrostatic Spray Application Directions for Use to Antimicrobial Product Registrations. This is truly a regulatory decision whether PPE is required for risk mitigation purpose. It does not fall under the authority of the Chemistry and Toxicology Team (CTT).